

B 28m

App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1930. 31
(Law)

File No. 160-30

Serial Nos. 1-7

Later References

CS 160-31-104 (Cmbl)
Law 77-32-1

(91)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos.

Part B for March 1932

SUBJECT.

Criminal Case no. 5 of 1930-31 (Mr. H.R. Venkata Subba Rao vs N.S. Sanjiva Rao) on the file of the District Magistrate, Bangalore.

7) 2

The Cont. Advocate.

No. P 5496 of 14.3.32

Instructions him to appear for part. in the appeal filed by Mr. V.S. Sanjiva Rao in the Sessions Court -
Hono.

In - Abdul Aziz
4.4.32

CONFIDENTIAL.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Tel. Address :
"ALACRIS"
PHONE NO. 298

No. C.C. 29/30-31
Encs. one.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE
IN MYSORE,

Dated Bangalore, 24th March, 1931.

From

F. A. HAMILTON, Esq., C.I.E.,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

To

N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE.


SIR,

1) I have the honour to enclose herewith a copy of the proceedings of a meeting held in the Gandhi Maidan on Friday the 20th March, 1931. A meeting, which for all intents and purposes was designed to give a hearty send off to the delegates to the Karachi Congress was, under the presidency of Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva Rao converted into one of censoring Government Officers.

2) I have asked for a report as to the truth in the allegations about the Sub Inspector mentioned.

3) The speech as a whole is objectionable and libellous.

4) The statements made are too wicked, malicious and damaging & cannot be left unnoticed, and I think the offender must be nailed down this time.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE.

1) The Extra Enquiry may be sent for and instructed to prosecute the offender for defamation. The allegation is prima facie defamatory & the offender is bound to be punished unless he proves the truth of the allegation. The action to be taken must be swift & effective, and the matter should at once be the case without the slightest delay.

2) The A.T. may be has to take necessary action to prevent Mr. Sanjeeva Rao from speaking in public for some time.

3) I think Govt must take a brave stand & stop this kind of vicious propaganda.

2nd member
L.W. Wain, through B.H. S. S.

NEW
27/3/31 P. H.

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

6) agree — altho' this leaves
the airtraps attack on me
untouched.

by
25/3/31

3rd Member

R.M.
28/3

7) I agree & prosecute but don't
think we need gag him at the same time.
What about the Police Reports?
We must be not allow him
to prosecute the man?

Don
26/3/31

10) Mat may come. Later, if
he misbehaves again, but not
just yet.

8) Mr. Sanjivani is
obviously going out of
all bounds and should
be stopped effectively
from indulging in such
vicious and vile insinuations.
The Dr. Magistrate should
be requested to take
necessary action to
prevent him from
making speeches with
the malicious object of
attacking Govt. Works.

9) The Enve Enve may
be requested to take
a complaint
defamation. A
regards the attack
against his brother it
would not be consistent
with the dignity of a member
to take a
complaint

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips,
the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on
this form.

Deewan

25/3/31 R.M.
28/3

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

- 1) The ^{new} City Mapto does not seem to be a proper person to buy this case.
- 2) In my opinion, the City Mapto must himself buy this case and the H. Court Circulars requiring City Mapto to buy some original cases will justify his buying this case.
- 3) Again, Mr. Hayward seems much to interested with this case.
- 4) It is necessary to write to the City Mapto & give him the map to him. He now also has to be passed. I explained this to the 3rd Members, and he said that he would send for the City Mapto & instruct him in the matter.
- 5) I approved: further action will be taken as suggested above.

R. M. L.
27/3

2nd Member

Ref.

16/3/31

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

- 1) Mr. N. Jones has been instructed to prepare the City Complaints, and the materials will be placed before him by the R.S.P. to the Chief Engineer.
- A. Draft of D. & forward an extract of the which is taken up for perusal before issue.

16/3

2nd Member

R. M. L.
27/3

G.R.S. III-3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

D.O. no 546 of 27th march
to Mr. M. S. Rangia
Ct. Secy

Another report in the same matter
from the Dt. Magistrate, Bangalore
adding a Post Script to the
effect that he has asked the
D.S.P. to make a formal
report to enable action under
sec 39 of the Police Regn, being
taken.

(13) In view of the Dewans' orders
already passed on this point,
the Dt. Magistrate will be asked
to post bond for the pursuit the
proposed action

2nd MemberH. M. S.
27/3

(14) 27/3/31

D.O. letter of 28th from
Mr. M. S. Rangia stating that
Mr. Venkateswaraiah has been
informed of the speech & that he
would take action.

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips,
the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on
this form.

5944730

Law 160-30

G.R.S. III-31

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

D.O. Letter of 19th March 1931
from Mr. Rangia re papers
to be sent to Mr. Nagaswara Rao

Letter of 30th from Mr. Nagaswara Rao
stating that the complaint was
filed & that the case is posted
to 7.4.1931.

Letter from Mr. Nagaswara Rao
dated 4.5.31 intimating that
on applⁿ of Sanjiva Rao, the
case has been adj^d to 16th
instant.

The case is now before
H.P. at
Sess B
May 24/6
(Please give a
file no)

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips,
the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on
this form

G.R.S. III-3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

D. O. No.

DEW
2 JUL 1931

7/83

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,

PUBLIC OFFICES,

CONFIDENTIAL.

Bangalore, 30th June 1931.

Dear Sir,

The suits against the Mysore Development -
Syndicate and the Mysore Asbestos Company, Ltd.,
were filed yesterday in the Court of the District
Judge, Bangalore.

(16) The application filed by Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva
Rao in the High Court for transfer of the case -
that has been filed against him by Mr. H.R. Venkata-
subba Rao, was heard yesterday and orders were -
pronounced to-day, rejecting the application. The
case, will therefore, proceed in the Court of the
District Magistrate, Bangalore, on the 3rd proximo.

Yours sincerely,

M. K. S. V. Rao


Subd for perusal
Secy
30/6/31 me
Secy
Dewan

(16) Secy
N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Bangalore.

(17) Secy
2-7-31

me 3/7/31

V.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips,
the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on
this form.



Secy B
150
4/7

The 1st para of this letter may be
extracted & kept in the linked
file & submitted: this may be kept
in order to await further
report.

Serial
No.

18) Dft to me Sur. Ad. & Subd for app.

TSD
13/7Done
mp
12/7

Sur A for a week

TSD
17/7
mp
15/7

Issued no. P. 340 d 4.7.31.

Letter no 37 dated 17th July 1931 from
Sur. Ad. forwarding a progress report, together
with copies of depositions of witnesses examined
in the case.

19) Subd for perusal

(50) mm
17/7/31

Second member

20) (50) km.
17/7/31Prot² Law(50) ~~not~~ mm.
20/7.

Subd to draft
final report of the
case sheet is passed to
mm.

TSD
21/7
mp
20/7

Flag 'A'

'B'

21) Mr V. S. Sayinvala Rao's speech of the 20th
March 1931 contained defamatory matter
against a Police Inspector named Mr.
Mugunvalappa (Vide position marked A).
The D.G.P. in his letter forwarding the
copy of the speech stated that he had called
for a report as to the truth in the
allegations about the Police officer.

22) ~~Kind reference is invited to~~ Dewan's
~~the mimicked notes~~ in para 9 of these
notes.

23) A draft enquiring as to the

File No.

of 193

General and Revenue
Secretariat

Further action taken by the D.G.P. in
this matter is put up for orders.

Chief Secretary
Thro. U. Secy, Protn. }

MP

28/7/31

Ce
28/7/31

24) Issue & submit to II Member & Dewan for perusal
29 JULY 1931

MP

30/7/31

Today

Issue & Re-submit

MP

30/7

To

The D.G. of Police

No. 644 dated 30.7.31 enquiring

what further action has been taken or is
proposed to be taken in the matter of
certain defamatory allegations made by
Mr. V.S. Sanjiva Rao against a Sub-Divisional
Magistrate by name Mugaralappa.

Sub-^o for perusal after time

TSO
5/7

Submitted for perusal.

Refce paras 21 to 24 supra

2nd member /

Dewan ✓

MP
3-8-31

MP

31-7-31

by
1/8/31

MP
1/8

MP
1/8/31

DEWAN'S OFFICE
3 - AUG. 1931

OFFICE OF THE
SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
1 AUG. 1931
No. 1219

Muz. 8]


Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

WD. 0562—GPB-2500—25-7-22.

D. O. No.

561831
P



GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,
PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 31st July 1931.


Dear Sir,

I write to inform you that the second Transfer Application filed before the High Court by Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva Rao, for the transfer of the Defamation Case filed against him, from the file of the District Magistrate, Bangalore was heard before the High Court yesterday and orders were reserved.

2. The case before the District Magistrate is posted to the 15th August 1931.

Yours sincerely,

N. Madhava Rao



Subd for perusal

neu

31/7/31

Second Member

Dewan ✓

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to the Government,
BANGALORE.

3-8-31

neu 1/8

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form.

neu 4/8

*Put up the reply from the
Secy. I received a couple of
back -*

neu 5/8

548

9

App. F. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No. of 193 .

Serial
No.

Letter no. Pol. 14 dated 31st July 1931
from the D. G. P. stating that though the
allegations made against the sub-inspector
Mugumappa may be false, his
circumstances ^{are such as to} lead to a lot of
controversy, which will be liable to
adverse criticism, and that he does
not consider it is a suitable case to present
in Court.

DEWANA OFFICE
1609
8 - AUG. 1931

Kind reference is invited to
para. 21-23. Supra
Sub: for perusal.

TSD
5/8

(Chief Secy)

mp
5/8

5 AUG. 1931

In the circumstances reported,
it is perhaps inexpedient to
pursue the matter

OFFICE OF THE
SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
8 AUG. 1931
No. 1544

Second Member
Deewan ✓

mu
7/8/31

mp
8/8

ku
8/8/31

ne
8/8

Im
8-8-31

RS
10/8/31

The letter received from
G. A. reporting the
dismissal of the
2nd trans. officer
may be placed
mp
NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Letter No 99 Dated 6.8.31 from the
Government advocate reporting the
dismissal of Mr. U.S. Sanyal's
application to the High Ct. for
transfer of the Defⁿ case filed
by against him by Mr. H. R.
Venkatasubbarao in the Court of
the Dist. Judge, Bangalore.

This is about the 2nd transfer
applⁿ filed by Mr. Sanyal.

The case is posted to 15/8/31
before the Dist. Judge for further
hearing.

Chief Secy)

Imp
8/8

For perusal

I Member

SD: H. V. R.
13/8

Dewan)

sd K. M.
14/8
sd H. V. R.
14/8
me
14/8

DEWAN'S OFFICE
15/8/31
15. AUG. 1931

me

15/8/31

15.8

In reply please refer to

No.

Tel. Address:—

"JURIST," Bangalore.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore.....14th August 1931..19-- .

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore, Bangalore.

To

The Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No.99
dated the 6th August 1931, I have the honor to -
forward herewith, for the information of Govern-
ment, a copy of the order passed in Criminal Pe-
tition No. 7 of 1931-32 on the file of the High -
Court of Mysore. (V. S. Sanjeeva Rao, Petitioner,
vs. The Government of Mysore).

GENERAL SECRETARY
15 AUG. 1931
No. 105
174

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

S. N. Nageswara
Government Advocate.

The order of Mr. Justice Srinivas
here rejecting the 2nd transfer application
of Mr. V. S. Sanjeeva Rao, as being frivolous
& vexatious makes very interesting
reading.

In this transfer applⁿ, ~~the~~ Sanjeeva
appears to have made serious allegations
against the Govt Advocate - Mr. Nageswara.

Serial
No.

slaf 'L'


accusing him of 'tutoring' the witnesses, relying on the evidence of P.W., - one Mr. Narasimha Sengupta - an official of the Geological Department. The evidence of this witness in Court was a source of surprise and anxiety. He appears to have attempted even to turn hostile, but perhaps the topic of facts must have prevented him from doing so.

The High Court have held that even the deposition of this witness does not lend any support to the serious accusation made by Mr. Sanyal. The learned Judge has made apt reference to the observation of Mr. Justice C.J. in the Bombay case, to the effect that "conduct of this sort," even in an accused, might amount to contempt of Court.

- Submitted for perusal.


(Gen Secy)

mp
15/8/31



I T. Sen
J. Sen

l. Sen
17.8.31



mp
17.8
18/8/31
H. Sen
18/8

mp
19/8/31
H. Sen

Serial
No.~~Adjudged~~ Adjudged to 1.9.31

" " 19.9.31.

Posted to 22.9.31 for

Cross Examⁿ of the first 3 witnesses for
Prosecution.

Letter no 218 dated 21.9.31 from
the Govt. Ad. reporting that the Complainant
and other witnesses for the Prosecution were
examined on 19th and the case stands
adjudged to 22nd inst for Cross Examⁿ of
the 1st 3 witnesses for the Prosecution

Sub^d for perusal.TSD
24/9.Stand's posted to 10th Oct 1931.1st Dec 31

2/1/32

File No. 3

of 193

General and Revenue
Secretariat

D. O. No.

2694931
p 8/31

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,

PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 16th Dec. 1931.

Dear Sir,

Re: Criminal Case No. 5 of 1930-31 on
the file of the District Magis-
trate, Bangalore. (Defamation -
case filed against Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva
Rao).

I write to inform you that the above case
came on for hearing before the District Magis-
trate this day. and five witnesses were examin-
ed for the defence, in addition to the two wit-
nesses who had already been examined the other
day. The case now stands posted for arguments
to the 2nd January 1932.

Yours sincerely,

N. Madhava Rao

CHIEF SECRETARY
18 DEC. 1931

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Bangalore.

Sub for perusal.


for Chief Secy)

mp 18/12

Secy Member)

nu 19/12

one 21/12
be 21/12



nu 21/12
Sub
for perusal

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

of 193

App. F. III-2]

15

Serial
No.

D. O.

no 37

3009/31

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,

PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 9th Jan. 1932

Dear Sir,

Re: Criminal Case No. 5/30-31
on the file of the Distt.
Magistrate, Bangalore. -
(V.S. Sanjeeva Rao - accd.)

I write to inform you that argu-
ments were heard in the above case, -
to-day, and it now stands posted for
Judgment to the 23rd instant.

Yours sincerely,

N. Madhava Rao

Let

Refers

nu 9/1

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Bangalore.

Submitted for perusal

Chief Secy)

nu 11.1.32

nu

Secy Member)

11/1/32

nu 12/1

nu 12/1

nu 12/1

nu 12/1

CHIEF SECRETARY
11 JAN. 1932

OFFICE OF THE
MEMBER OF COUNCIL
12 JAN. 1932
5603

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

nu 180 12/1

nu

16
File No:

3009
of 193

General and Revenue
Secretariat

D

GOVERNMENT, ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS.
PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 27th January.....1932

Dear Sir,

Re: Criminal Case No. 5 of 30-31
on the file of the District
Magistrate, Bangalore. (V.
Sanjeeva Rao - Accused).

The above case was posted for Judgment
to the 23rd instant, but as the accused
did not attend the Court on that day and p.
for adjournment, it now stands posted
for the 4th February 1932 for Judgment.

Yours sincerely

N. Mahava Rao


Subd for perusal

me

Deputy Member

28/1/32

N. Mahava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
BANGALORE.



D. O.

3614831
GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,

PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 6th February, 1932

Dear Sir,

Re: Criminal Case No.5/1930-31 on
the file of the District Magis-
trate, Bangalore. (Mr. V.S.
Sanjeeva Rao - Accused).

I write to inform you that the above
case was posted for Judgment to this day,
but as the accused did not turn up even -
to-day, the case has been adjourned to the
12th instant for the same purpose.

Yours sincerely,

N. Madhava Rao

Subj for perusal

Secy to Govt

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.
Chief Secretary to Government,
B A N G A L O R E.

7/2/32
one Mr 9/1

3692831
P

369284
P

D. O.


GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,
PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 12th Feb. 1932.

DEWANI
582
15 FEB. 1932

OFFICE
132

Dear Sir,



Re: Criminal Case No.5/1930-31
on the file of the District
Magistrate, Bangalore. -
(Mr. V. S. Sanjeeva Rao -
accused).

I write to inform you that Judgment was delivered in the above case this day. The accused has been convicted and sentenced to undergo Simple Imprisonment for three months and to pay a fine of Rs. 500/- and in default of payment offline, to undergo simple imprisonment for another 2 months.

In. perusal

Yours sincerely,

Secy. Member / 13/2/32

W. S. Sanjeeva Rao

Dewan N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Bangalore.

16/2

13/4/32

18/5/32

16/2


dit calling for a copy
of judgment

16/2

2/2
18/2

Issued
17/2

Issued no. 1. 4676 d 19.2.32



Sm A
me

4/10/32

19

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

of 1932

[App. F. III-2]

Serial
No.

from,

The Genl. Advocate


D.O. dated 1st March 1932 forwarding a copy of the Judgment in case no. 5/3031 on the file of the Dist. Magistrate (H.R. Venkatasubrahmanyam vs. Sanyal & Co.) and intimating that the accused has filed an appeal against his conviction in the Sessions Court, which is fixed to next week.

Copy of the Judgment is sent for perusal

13/3/32

2nd member)

10/3/32



I understand the hearing of the appeal has been adj'd.

It is necessary that the conviction should be supported before the appellate court. Mr. Venkatasubrahmanyam being dead, the Genl. Advocate may be asked to represent the Crown & support the conviction. (I suppose this is permissible)

10/3/32

10/3/32

Under Sec 422 of the Criminal Procedure Code, it seems to be obligatory on the part of the Appellate Court to give notice of the appeal to the Crown in all cases and the Crown can consequently appear in any criminal appeal to support the conviction. There is therefore no objection in asking

The Govt Advocate to appear in the appeal
in this case.

Draft accordingly is put up for
approval:

(2nd member)

12/3/32

12/3/32

Issue today



14/3

To,

The Govt. Adv.

No. P. 8496 dated 14.3.32 instructing

~~for~~ him to appear for Govt in the appeal
filed by Mr. V.S. Sanjiv Rao in the Sessions Court
B'lore.



San B.

15/3

15/3

Bt sus

15/3

15/3

41438/825
21

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Tel. Address

"ALACRIS"

PHONE No. 298

CONFIDENTIAL.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
IN MYSORE.

Camp: Mandya,

Dated ~~Bangalore~~, 20th March, 1932.

When replying
please quote

No. C.C. 29/30-31.

From

F. A. HAMILTON, Esq., C.I.E.,

Inspector General of Police in Mysore,

Camp: Mandya. ~~BANGALORE~~

To

N. MADHAVA RAO, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

SIR,

I have the honour to invite your kind reference to my letter No. C.C. 29/30-31 dated 24th March, 1931, with which I sent a copy of the proceedings of a meeting held in the Gandhi Maidan on Friday the 20th March, 1931. I find ~~from~~ that the office draft of the letter addressed to you - No.C.C.29/30-31 dated 24th March, 1931, - has been exhibited on the defence side in C.C. No.5/30-31 on the file of the District Magistrate, Bangalore District.

I, therefore, request you to kindly send me a copy of my letter adverted to above.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

F. A. Hamilton
INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE.

If approved copy of the letter referred to
will be got typed and sent to me


D.S.P.

Yes. Please put up draft

TSD
29/3

Dfr. P. M. S.

MP
29.3.



TSD
29/3

Issue

MP

Issued no. 5740 dated 29.3.32

B. S. M.

TSD

CONFIDENTIAL.

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN, B.A.
Deputy Commissioner

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
BANGALORE.

D.O.C. 201/30-31


Enc. Two

Dated..26th..M..a..r..c..h....1931.

Dear Sir,

In enclosing herewith for the information of Government, copy of a confidential D.O letter No C.C. 12/30-31 of the 21st March 1931, received from the Superintendent of Police, Bangalore City and Taluk, together with a copy of its enclosure, regarding a public meeting held at the Gandhi Maidan on Friday the 20th March 1931, at 6 P.M., under the Presidentship of Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva Rao, I beg to invite your kind reference to the portion marked in red pencil.

Yours sincerely,




P. Mahadeviah, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Law Department,
Bangalore.

P.S.- The District Superintendent of Police, has been advised to put a formal report before the District Magistrate in order to enable action under Section 39 of the Mysore Police Regulation.

Copy of confidential D.O. letter No. C.C. 12/30-31 dated the 21st March 1931, from the Superintendent of Police, Bangalore City and Taluk, to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

I enclose herewith a copy of the proceedings of a meeting held in the Gandhi Maiden on Friday the 20th March 1931. The whole speech of Mr. Sanjeeva Rao seems to be very objectionable. He is speaking without any kind of restraint. I think he should be prohibited from speaking in the public in future. His previous history too is bad. He was holding the post of a Jamedar in the Police Department and was dismissed on account of corruption. He was concerned during the last disturbances and was convicted for having assaulted a Police Officer on duty..

" C o p y "


Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

SRD/26-3-31.

Committee. Mr. Chandra Sekhara Iyer who did not even give food to his parents has been selected as the Chairman of this Committee. He has no children. He has no wife. He has nobody to think of. Until his father's death he had not gone to him. When I was taken as a probationary ~~xxxxxCommissionerxxxxx~~ Jamedar, he was appointed as a Probationary Asst. Commissioner. When I was reading in the F.A. Class, he was reading in the B.A. Class. I was earning a small sum. Now he has retired. So am I. This gentleman has been appointed as the chairman of the retrenchment Committee.

Whatever it might be we want water to drink. Look at that road. There are six lights in that chowk. What is the use of having lights at 6 O'clock in the evening. Lights take away the current - energy. And so there is no current in the machines at Thippogindanahally. The result is there is no water supply to Bangalore City. What is the use of such lights? If any one asks we will say that we have got the Mirza Square, Marasimharaja Square, the Krishnaraja Square and so on. But what of water. There is no water at all.

I hope that an young member of the Legislative Council will raise these questions in the next sessions. He will also ask the Government as to why the P.W.D. post office was changed from Mr.K. Nathan, and what action the Government has taken in the matter of complaints received against the police officer. There are police people here. But they will not understand what I say, nor do they know what they have to do or to work. We say something and they will say something. I do not think that they ~~xxx~~ report these matters at all.

To-day we have met here on an auspicious occasion. Some of our friends are going to attend the Karachi session of the Congress. Two or three of them have come here with the national flags in their hands. We wish them all success in their journey and their duty at the Conference. We hope that they will properly represent Mysore and the States' Peoples' in general.

Mr. Ramaswamy Iyengar speaking next said: (Kannada)

As the President has already stated, we all wish the delegates to the Congress success. Our duty does not end in merely attending the Congress. Nor should we think that our work is over after the Agreement reached between Mahatma Gandhi and Lord Irwin. We have to wait till the Karachi Session is over. Our future will be constituted on the decisions of this Session of the Congress. After fighting for the past 12 years, Mahatma Gandhi has entered into certain agreement with the British Government. We wish Sir Gupta would become the next Viceroy of India. It may be we have to prepare ourselves for another war. Anyhow we have to closely watch the Karachi Congress. We wish all success to the delegates to the Karachi Congress.

After the singing of the National song by different people, the meeting concluded. There were about 100 people gathered there

Bangalore City
21st March 1931.

V. Soma Sundaram
Stenographer,
Office of the Superintendent
of Police, Bangalore
City & Taluk.

H. H. Somappa
For Superintendent of Police,
Bangalore City and Taluk

27th March 31

CONFIDENTIAL AND IMMEDIATE.

Dear Mr. Rangiah,

I am directed to forward herewith
an extract of a report of a Public Meeting held at the
Gandhi Maidan on Friday the 20th March 1931 at 6 P.M.
under the Presidentship of Mr. V.S.Sanjeeva Rao.

Yours sincerely,

P. M. R.

To

M.G.Rangiah, Esq., B.A., B.E.,
Chief Engineer and Secretary to
Government, P.W.D. Bangalore.

A public meeting was held at the Gandhi Maidan on Friday the 20th March 1931 at 6 P.M. under the Presidentship of Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva Rao, to give a hearty send off to the delegates to the Karachi Congress.

After the singing of the National Song, Mr. Sanjeeva Rao spoke as follows (In Kannada).

To-day is the Ugadi day. Most of us will enjoy the New year. But the one great difficulty is that we have no water even to drink. In Chamarajpet there is not even a drop of water. So many of us did not take oil bath to-day. It is very difficult under these circumstances to pay the water tax. In C & M. Station Mr. Jeremiah, a member of the Bangalore Rate Payers Association has called for a meeting at the Bowring Institute, to consider this point and to appeal to Government for better water supply as otherwise there would be no collection of water-rate. I hope that all those sufferers from city will attend the meeting and say that none of us are willing to pay the water tax, as water is not allowed to us. Our Maharaja sanctioned for the construction of a tank at Hessarghatta, and then another at Mallappa's tank. Now finding that these two are not adequately supplying water to city he has sanctioned lakhs of rupees for the construction of a reservoir at Thippogandahalli. For constructing this reservoir there are so many contractors who want to undertake the work. In this connection there is competition between the contractors and they offer large sums to the Government officers, the Engineers. Now it is understood that on account of the Executive Engineer in charge of the construction of the said Reservoir received bribes he has been transferred to Kolar, that he should hand over charge within 24 hours. The Member in ~~charge~~ charge Mr. K. Matthan, has swallowed Rs 40,000 and so the portfolio has been changed. When even the members in Council take such bribes and even then do not arrange for the proper supply of water it looks too difficult for us to

manage. I hear that Mr Matthan is even retiring now.

x

x

x

x

"Extract"

Bangalore City,
21st March 1931.

(Sd) V.Somasundaram,
Stenographer, Office of the
Superintendent of Police,
Bangalore City & Taluk.

(Sd) N.K.Somappa,
For Superintendent of Police,
Bangalore City and Taluk.

"C O P Y"

P. Mahadevappa
Secretary to Government,
Law Department.

CONFIDENTIAL.

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN, B.A.
Deputy Commissioner

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
BANGALORE. 8

Dated. 26th March 1931.

D. O. C.C. 12/30-31

Enc. 1000

To Law Secy with
Compliments
over 3/3/31

Dear Sir,

*To be placed in the
C.C. file.
P. 30/3* In enclosing herewith for the information of
Government, copy of a confidential D.O. letter No
C.C. 12/30-31 of the 21st March 1931, received from
the Superintendent of Police, Bangalore City and
Taluk, together with a copy of its enclosure, re-
garding a public meeting held at the Gandhi Maidan
on Friday the 20th March 1931, at 6 P.M., under the
Presidentship of Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva Rao, I beg to
invite your kind reference to the portion marked in
red pencil.

Yours sincerely,

K. V. Anantaraman

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.


P.S.- The District Superintendent of Police, has been
advised to put a formal report before the Dis-
trict Magistrate in order to enable action under
Section 39 of the Mysore Police Regulation.

b

Copy of confidential D.O. letter No. C.C. 12/30-31 dated the 21st March 1931, from the Superintendent of Police, Bangalore City and Taluk, to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

I enclose herewith a copy of the proceedings of a meeting held in the Gandhi Maidan on Friday the 20th March 1931. The whole speech of Mr. Sanjeeva Rao seems to be very objectionable. He is speaking without any kind of restraint. I think he should be prohibited from speaking in the public in future. His previous history too is bad. He was holding the post of a Jamedar in the Police Department and was dismissed on account of corruption. He was concerned during the last disturbances and was convicted for having assaulted a Police Officer on duty.

" C o p y "


Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

SRD/26-3-31.

Committee. Mr. Chandra Sekhara Iyer who did not even give food to his parents has been selected as the Chairman of this Committee. He has no children. He has no wife. He has nobody to think of. Until his father's death he had not gone to him. When I was taken as a probationary ~~magistrate~~ Jamedar, he was appointed as a Probationary Asst. Commissioner. When I was reading in the F.A. Class, he was reading in the B.A. Class. I was earning a small sum. Now he has retired. So am I. This gentleman has been appointed as the chairman of the retrenchment Committee.

Whatever it might be we want water to drink. Look at that road. There are six lights in that chowk. What is the use of having lights at 6 O'clock in the evening. Lights take away the current - energy. And so there is no current in the machines at Thippogindanahally. The result is there is no water supply to Bangalore City. What is the use of such lights? If any one asks we will say that we have got the Mirza Square, Narasimharaja Square, the Krishnaraja Square and so on. But what of water. There is no water at all.

I hope that a young member of the Legislative Council will raise these questions in the next sessions. He will also ask the Government as to why the L.D. port folio was changed from Mr. Nathan, and what action the Government has taken in the matter of complaints received against the police officer. There are police people here. But they will not understand what I say, nor do they know what they have to do or to work. We say something and they will say something. I do not think that they ~~will~~ report these matters at all.

To-day we have met here on an auspicious occasion. Some of our friends are going to attend the Karachi session of the Congress. Two or three of them have come here with the national flags in their hands. We wish them all success in their journey and their duty at the Conference. We hope that they will properly represent Mysore and the States' complex in general.

Mr. Karaswamy Iyengar speaking next said: (Mysore)

As the President has already stated, we all wish the delegates to the Congress success. Our duty does not end in merely attending the Congress. Nor should we think that our work is over after the agreement reached between Mahatma Gandhi and Lord Irwin. We have to wait till the Karachi Session is over. Our future will be constituted on the decisions of this Session of the Congress. After fighting for the past 12 years, Mahatma Gandhi has entered into certain agreement with the British Government. We wish Sir Gupta could become the next Viceroy of India. It may be we have to prepare ourselves for another Mr. Anyhow we have closely watch the Karachi Congress. We wish all success to the delegates to the Karachi Congress.

After the singing of the National song by different people, the meeting concluded. There were about 100 people gathered there.

Bangalore City
21st March 1931.

S. A. S. Ram
Stenographer,
Office of the Superintendent
of Police, Bangalore
City & Taluk.

A. K. Somappa
For Superintendent of Police,
Bangalore City and Taluk



PUBLIC WORKS SECRETARIAT,

12

28-3-1931

Law 160-30-2

Dear Mr. Mahadevaya,

your A.P. letter No. 546

28/3/31

dated the 27th March 31

I have shown the enclosure to Mr. H.P. Venkata Subba Rao & he said he would see you and take instructions to prosecute Mr. Sanjiva Rao for the defamatory speech he has made.

Yours sincerely
Mr. Nanjappa



PUBLIC WORKS SECRETARIAT,

29.3.19

Immediate
& Confidential

Dear Mr. Mahadwaraj,

The

320 members' personal
 Assistant to me yesterday
 day that you wanted
 the papers required by
 Mr. Nageswarrao
 to be sent to him. I hesi-
 tated in the absence of
 a formal intimation
 that his engagement
 has been approved by the
 Govt. I interviewed
 the Second Member this

¹⁴
Morning. He said that
you might select
whatever papers are
required to be sent
& then pass on. I am
therefore sending ^{with Mr. Foster} the
file of papers relating to
the transport of pipes &
also the Gazette notifica-
tion relating to the transfer.
You may pass on
whatever you think
necessary to Mr. Napier
Warraigh & oblige.

Yours sincerely,

Wm. Napier
29.3.31

Bangalore 15

30. 3. 31

Law 160-30-3

Dear Sir,

The criminal complaint for def-
amation on behalf of Mr HR Venkatasubba Rao
was filed today. Bailable warrants were
ordered and the case is posted to 7.4.31.
Summons to witnesses have also been
taken.

Yours Sincerely
S. K. S. S. S. S. S.

To

P. Mahadevayya Esq B.A.B.
Law Secy. to Govt.
Bangalore.

SUBJECT.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No.

To

The Govt. Advocate

General and Revenue Secretariat

()

the

193

Date of issue.....

14.7.31

Signed by.....

Sd/- J. J. J.

Sir,

Adverting to your

D.O. letter dated 30th June 1931

intimating that the defamation case would be proceeded

against Mr. Sanjeeva Rao on the

with in the Court of the

Judge of the Dist. Magistrate, Bangalore, &

passed the 3rd inst. I am directed

to request that the progress made

in the case on the above date

may kindly be intimated for

information of Govt. as an early

date

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Sd/- J. J. J.

Examined by.....

Sd/- J. J. J.

I have etc
18/7 for Ch. Secy

18

14th July 1931.

Conf

The Government Advocate,
Bangalore.

D.O.

Adverting to your letter dated 30th June 1931, intimating that the defamation case against Mr. Sanjeeva Rao would be proceeded with in the Court of the District Magistrate, Bangalore, on the 3rd instant, I am directed to request you that the progress made in the case on the above date may kindly be intimated for information of Government at an early date.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Chief Secretary to Government.

VSD

S.R.-2

IMMEDIATE
&
CONFIDENTIAL.

285931
p8

19

In reply please refer to
No. 39
Tel. Address: -
"JURIST," Bangalore.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore...17th...J...u...l...y...19 31..

Law 160-30-4

From

A. R. Nagesvara Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Government Advocate in Mysore,
BANGALORE.

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. P.348/Law. dated
the 14th July 1931, Re: Defamation Case against Mr. V. S.

Sanjeeva Rao, I have the honor to state that the case came on
for hearing on the 3rd July 1931, before the District Magis-
trate, and four witnesses were examined for the prosecution on
that day. Copies of their deposition which were received
to-day, are enclosed herewith for the information of Government.
The case now stands adjourned to the 22nd instant for the -
examination of the Complainant and his other witnesses. Mr.
Sanjeeva Rao filed, on the 13th instant, another Transfer Appli-
cation before the High Court, which is pending disposal. I may
note in passing, that I am thinking of giving up the evidence
of the two Police Constables who have been summoned to give -
evidence on behalf of the Complainant.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

A. R. Nagesvara Iyer

Government Advocate.

CSN.

In the Court of the District Magistrate Bangalore.

C.C.No. 5. of 30-31.

P.W.1.

Deposition of Mr.H.V.Krishan Rao

Father. Mr.H.Visvanatha Bhatta.

Age. 48

Caste. Smartha Brahmin.

Occupation. Asst.Suptd.Of Police, C.I.D.

Residence. Bangalore City.

Duly Sworn.

I am Asst.Superintendent of Police attached to the Office of the Inspector General of Police. I am in charge of the Political Section. All reports from the D.S.P.'s are received in my section. I received from the D.S.P. Bangalore City and Taluk the report relating to the Speech made by Mr.V.S.Sanjiva Rao on the 20th March 1931. It was despatched to my Office on the 21st March and received in my office on ~~the~~ the 21st March. Ex.P.1. is the report.

Cross Examination. Reserved.

R.O.& A.C.

Sd.K.V.Anantaraman.

Dt.Magistrate.

3 - 7 - 31.

"COPY"

C.C.No.5 of 30-31.

P.W. 2.

Deposition of Mr.V. Somasundaram.

Father Mr.V.N.Shanmugha Mudaliar.

Age. 23.

Caste. Mudaliar.

Occupation. Stenographer, Office of the Supdt. Of Police
Bangalore City & Taluk.

Residence. Bangalore City.

Duly Sworn.

I am stenographer in the office of the D.SP. Bangalore. My duty is to attend meetings, take down the proceedings and submit reports to the A.S.P. I know Mr.Sanjiva Rao. On Yugadi day there was a meeting in the Chhandhi Maidan in the Evening. Ghandhi maidan is situated in front of the Minto Hospital and by the side of the Fort High School. I attended the meeting at 6 P.M. Mr. Sanjiva Rao made a speech. I took it down in short hand. Ex.P.1. is the report. I typed it. I have got the short hand notes made by me. I have brought it. Ex.P.2. is my ^{notes} report. I reported the occurrences on that day to the A.S.P. after the meeting. Next morning, I typed the speech from my notes and submitted to the A.S.P. Ex.P.1. is typed by me. I have signed it. I submitted it to Mr. ~~Somasundaram~~ ^{Somappa} the A.S.P. I submitted it on the 21st March. Ex.P.1.A. relates to the complainant Mr.H.R.Venkatasubba Rao. Mr.Sanjiva Rao said:- "Now finding that these two are not adequately supplying water to City he has sanctioned lakhs of Rupees for the construction of a reservoir at Thippagondhana Halli. In constructing this reservoir there are so many contractors who want to undertake this work. In this connection there is competition between the Contractors and they offered large sums to the Government Officers." the Engineers. Now it is understood that on account of the Executive Engineer in charge of the construction of the said reservoir received bribes, he has been transferred to Kolar and that he should hand over charge within 24 hours." He spoke in Kanarese. I took it down in shorthand in English.

Cross Examination . RESERVED.

R.O. & A.C.
Sd.K.V.Anantaraman.
Dt, Magistrate. 3.7.31.

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, BANGALORE.

C.C.No.5/30-31

P.W.3

Deposition of Mr. U.K.Somappa
 Father Kalappa
 Age 28
 Caste Lingayet.
 Occupation Assistant to the I.G.P.in Mysore.
 Residence Bangalore city

DULY SWORN.

I was A.S.P. Bangalore for one and a half years. I know P.W.2. He works in the City Superintendents office. He is a Steno Typist. His duty is to attend meetings, take down notes and send ~~that~~ up typed reports to me. He reported to me at 8-30 or 9 P.M. on the 20th March that there was a meeting on Gandhi Mydan that day and that Mr.V.S. Sanjeeva Rao addressed the meeting. He said that Mr.S.Rao said that the E.Engeneer Thippagondanahally after works had taken bribes, that he was transferred to Kolar and asked to hand over charge in 24 hours. He said that Mr.S.Rao made allegations against other officers including the member. I got the typewritten report from P.W.2 on the morning of the 21st March. I see Ex.P.1 that is the report submitted to me by P.W.2. It bears my signature. I submitted this to D.S.P. This is the copy sent ~~at~~ to I.G.P. A copy was sent ~~at~~ the Deputy Commissioner. This was on the 21st March. The Executive Engeneer of thippagondanahalli was Mr.Venkata Subba Rao.

X EXAMINATION.

I was not present at the meeting. Gandhi Mydan is half a mile from my office. I see from the report that about 100m people were present. No names of these present are given there. P.W.2 was under me for 7 or 8 months - in fact from his first appointment. P.W.2 is a Steno-Typist. He is up to the mark. I do not know his speed in taking down speeches. I have not tested it. He said that the speech was in Canerese. P.W.2 knows Kanarese. We send the reports in English. And so the report was made in English. I did not ~~think~~ think that there was any difficulty to get the report in Canerese. About 2 or 3 Police officers, Sergeant Krishnappa and P C's Narayana Rao and Kesava Murthy had gone with P.W.2. They have not submitted report. I did not call for any report from them. Krishnappa is literate in English, Kesavamurthy

Kesavamurthy known ^{was} Canerese and Narayana Rao known ^s english and Canerese. I did not ask Narayana Rao to submit a report. I did not ~~make~~ make any notes of the oral report made to me. I was then in the Crime branch Police Station in the Fort. The D.S.P. was not there. He was in the town. Reports were not sent to the I.G. of Police and the Deputy Commissioner that day. Reports were sent on the 21st by muddam. I have corrected spelling mistakes in the report. I have not improved the spelling. I do not remember having met the Deputy Commissioner. I might have met the Deputy Commissioner. I meet him often in his office or in his house. I did not report to the D.C. personally about these. I had no ^{personal} conversation with the Deputy Commissioner about this. I did not write to the I.G. of Police. I submitted the report of the Stenographer without any remarks of any words. I did not talk to the I.G.P. about this. I am a direct subordinate of the D.S.P. I had no ~~instructions~~ instructions from him in this case. The D.S.P. carries on correspondence. So far as my knowledge goes I can swear that there was no D.O. about this case.

QUESTION.

Is there any D.O. number 156 dated 5th May 1931.

Answer. I must see the register. The office maintains a register. I have not seen D.O. No 156. I am in charge of the office. I know nothing about the Police writing to the Executive Engineer about this case. I was not asked to meet the Executive Engineer. I do not know where he ~~was~~ was after the 20th March. I do not know if he was in charge of Thinnabar gondanahalli on the 20th March. P.W.2 sends up reports of all political meetings. He has submitted reports of other speeches made by Mr. Sanjeeva Rao. I do not remember about the speech made by Mr. Sanjeeva Rao about the Child marriage bill. I must see the report. We preserved the reports. No order was received on the report by me. I do not know if Deputy Commissioner has made any remarks on the Deputy Commissioner's report. I do not know what he did with it. The report to the Deputy Commissioner do not come back. If any action is necessary reports will be called for. I do not see Mr. B. Venkata Subba Rao before he filed the complaint. I did not work up the case for him or lend him the services of the Detectives. I did not give the names of those present. I do not know if Mr. Venkata Subba Rao was present. I enquired of P.W.2 as to how many were present. I did not enquire as to who were all present. I did not supply to the complainant the names of those present. I ~~remember~~ did not ask any of the witnesses to meet the complainant. I did not ask any witness to go to Mr. Nageswar Iyer, I

I cannot say if D.S.P. asked any witness to go to Mr. Nageswara Iyer. No private witness has been paid T.A. to this case. There is the contingency fund. Nothing was paid out of this to witnesses. I have no record of the names of those present. Neither has my office. I did not enquire who were present.

RESERVED.

R O & A ⁶₅

Sd/- K.V. Anantaraman

District Magistrate. 3-7-1931.

C.C.No.5/30-31

P.W.4

Deposition of Mr.A.Narasimah Ayengar
Father " Kesava Char

Age 55

Caste Sre Vyshunava, Brahmin

Occupation Office Assistant Geological ~~Assis~~ Department.

Residence Bangalore City

Duly Sworn.

I attended the meeting in the Ghandhi maidan on the last t
Fugadi day. I had gone to the Apex Bank on business. Hence I went
to the meeting. Mr.Sanjiva Rao the accused spoke at the meeting., about
the trouble about the water. He said that about the reservoirs that the
Ex.Engineer in charge of Thippagondhanahalli had taken bribes and re-
commended the highest tender, and that consequently, he had been trans-
ferred and asked to hand over charge in 24 hours. This meeting took
place at 6 P.M. 70 or 80 persons were present.

Cross Examination. I am 55 years of age. I have just been given an
extension. Mr.Sampathchary is my officer and he recommended the ex-
tension. There was only one meeting on the Ghandhi maidan. Hundreds
of people were present at the Apex Bank. It was the Anniversary of the
City Co-operative Bank. At the apex bank meeting hall some persons
were talking about the sudden transfer of the Executive engineer, Thip-
pagondhanahalli water works and its being due to his taking bribes. in
connection with the tenders about the contracts. The meeting went on
till after 6.30 P.M. Many distinguished persons were present at the
Bank meeting including high officers and advocates. I am a share-
holder of the City Co-operative Bank. I was at the Apex Bank meeting
for about 2 hours. I came on to the Ghandhi maidan, at 6 P.M. The
meeting was just begun. There was no light. It was a dark night.
I did not know if the Police were present. There was a table and bench.
I did not notice any one taking notes near the chair. The D.S.P.
wrote to me a letter asking me to see Mr.Nageswara Iyer. Ex.D.1. is that

April

is that letter. It is dated 2nd July. I met Mr. Nageswara Iyer in his office, in the morning. I did not meet him at 8 P.M. The Police gave a statement to me. It was a manuscript copy that was put into my hands. I read it. I did not take a copy. I was asked to be prepared to answer the court and not to get confused in Cross-examination. Mr. Nageswara Iyer Himself gave me the statement. No. it is the Supdt. of Police. The Superintendent of Police; Mr. Ranajodha Singh was present. Mr. Somappa was not present. I saw Mr. Nageswara Iyer a day previous to the ~~meeting~~ hearing. I was there for quarter of an hour. I did not note down what they wanted me to remember. ~~about the transfer~~ They wanted me to remember about the transfer, the handing over of charge within 24 hours, the recommendation about the tenders and the bribes. Only three of us were present. The door was closed. I believe. The Police came to me once or twice. Once Mr. Ranajodha Singh himself came before the case was instituted. Mr. Somappa had also come to my house once. Some P.C. in musti brought the letter. Two of my sons are brought under "the Foreigners Act" here as Political refugees. The police do not come to my house every day. The D.S.P. did not promise me any extension of service. The D.S.P. told me that it was a Government case. The D.S.P. and A.S.P. did not meet me again. Mr. Nageswara Iyer asked me not to get puzzled.

RESERVED.

Re.Exam:- When I went to the Ghandhi Maidan Mr. Sanjiva Rao was speaking. The conversation in the Apex Bank about the Executive Engineer took place in the verandah and not in the meeting hall. The D.S.P. when he came to my house asked me if I was present at the meeting. He said that a case would be instituted and that I should speak out what I know. I told him what I knew when he asked me. I have told him what I have told the Court. The British Police brought my sons here and the local police brought them to me. Mr. Sanjiva Rao did not ask me about the D.O. QUESTION:- Why any pressure put on you by the Police. ANSWER:- No. - My sons took part in the Civil disobedience campaign and that was why they were brought here. Mr. Nageswara Iyer asked me if I attended the meeting and what I knew of the matter. I have told him what I have told the court. The door of the centre room it was that was closed and we were in ~~the~~ another room.

A.O. & S.C. SD.K.V. ANANTARAMAN. DT.MAG.
3.7.31.

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No.

Confidential

General and Revenue Secretariat

()

the

193 .

To

The Inspector General of Police

Date of issue.....

30.7.31

Signed by.....

M. V. N. Y.

Sir, I am desired to invite your ~~letter~~ reference to your letter No. C.C. 29/30-31 dated 24th March 1931, wherein you intimated that you had called for a report as to the birth ^{or otherwise} ~~the~~ of certain defamatory allegations made by Mr V. S. Sanyivaras against a Sub Inspector by name Huguvalappa, and to enquire what further action has been taken ^{or is proposed to be taken} in the matter ^{and if} of the allegations.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

[over

26

why
are false, the Sub Inspector should not
be asked to
~~be asked to~~ prosecuting Mr.
Sanjiva Rao for defamation, ~~and~~
~~clearing his character~~

I have etc

~~mu~~
Chief Secy

DM
28/7.

6 28/7

29

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

CONFIDENTIAL.

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 30th July 1931.

No.

From

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

F.A. Hamilton, Esq., C.I.E.,
Inspector General of Police in Mysore,
B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

I am directed to invite your reference to your letter No.C.C. 29/30-31 dated 24th March 1931, wherein you intimated that you had called for a report as to the truth or otherwise of certain --
defamatory allegations made by Mr. V.S. Sanjiva Rao against a Sub Inspector by name Muguvalappa and to enquire what further action has been taken or is proposed to be taken in the matter and if the allegations are false why the Sub Inspector should not be asked to prosecute Mr. Sanjiva Rao for defamation.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,



In Chief Secretary to Government.

TSD

CONFIDENTIAL

POLICE DEPARTMENT

588/31
P 30

Tel. Address :
"ALACRIS"

PHONE NO. 298

No. Pol 14.
Encs.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE
IN MYSORE,

Dated Bangalore, the 31st July 1931.

From

F. A. HAMILTON, Esq., C.I.E.,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

To

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Bangalore.

SIR,

Subject;- Defamatory allegations against Sub Inspector Mugavalappa.

With reference to your letter No.P.644/Law dated the 30th July, 1931,

I have the honor to state that I have gone into the case and do not consider it is a suitable one to present in Court. The Sub Inspector's salary is Rs.65/- per mensem with cycle allowance Rs.7-8-0. Out of this, he pays Insurance - premiums monthly amounting to Rs.16-14-0 and an additional one of Rs.25-8-0 half yearly. He owes the Mysore Bank Rs.769-1-0 and has not been able to pay anything against this, this year, owing to the failure of his crops. He also owes the Municipality Rs.440/- but can get rid of this debt at any time by selling the sites purchased by him for Rs.1015/-.

Though the allegation made against him may be false, his circumstances, liable will lead to a lot of controversy which will be ~~opened~~ to open the road to adverse criticism.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,


INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE



Law's Defec
mu 1/8/31
me
3/8

6749
P 31

In reply please refer to
No. 99/31/32

Tel. Address:-
"JURIST," Bangalore.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore.....6th.....August.....19 31.

Law 16-30-5

From

A.R. Nagesvara Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Government Advocate in Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Law Sec
To
SECRETARY
6 AUG 1931
Sir,

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

Re: Criminal Petition No. 7 of 1931-32 on the
file of the High Court of Mysore, (V. S.
Sanjiva Rao VS. Government of Mysore) for
transfer of Criminal Case No.5/30-31 from
the file of the District Magistrate,
Bangalore.

xx
me
+7.8

I have the honor to state that orders were passed
in the above case to-day rejecting the Application for -
transfer.

OFFICE OF THE
FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL
14 AUG. 1931
No. 1754

2. A copy of the order has been applied for and the
same will be forwarded to Government as soon as it is re-
ceived in this office.

GENERAL SECRETARY
10 AUG. 1931
No. 1119

about
This is the 2nd transfer application
filed by Mr. Sanjivadas.
The case is posted to 15/8/31
before the Dt mag for further
hearing. (The main file is now
N. subd to the Dewan for
perusal of D.G.P's reply
regarding action to be
taken by the Police Inspector
Mungvalabba)

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Ar. Nagesvara Iyer
Government Advocate.
G

1931

(Chief Secy)
for perusal
I Member
1000 13/8
14/8
me 14/8

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MYSORE AT BANGALORE.

Thursday the 6th day of August 1931.

BEFORE

MR. JUSTICE G. -SREENIVASA IYER.

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 7 of 1931-32 presented on 13-7-1931 by the petitioner Vidya Bhushana V.S. Sanjiva Rao (accused) praying that Criminal Case No. 5 of 1930-31 on the file of the District Magistrate of Bangalore, may be transferred to that of any other competent Magistrate outside the Bangalore District, for disposal.

Heard:-

Petitioner in person.

Mr. A. R. Nagesvara Iyer,
Government Advocate
for Government.

O R D E R.

This is the second application under Section 526 of the Criminal Procedure Code for transfer of Criminal Case No. 5 of 1930-31 on the file of the District Magistrate, Bangalore, to the file of any other court outside the Bangalore District on the ground that there is an apprehension in the mind of the petitioner that he may not have a fair and impartial trial.

The ground of his apprehension mentioned in the affidavit filed by the petitioner in support of his application

-2-

application are:-

- (1) that the District Magistrate received in his executive and official capacity a report in this case and dealt with the matter,
- (2) that the petitioner is a congress worker and that the District Magistrate's order in connection with the National Flag does not inspire confidence in the Congress workers' minds, and
- (3) that the District Superintendent of Police wrote a letter to Prosecution Witness No. 4 in the case to see the Government Advocate and that the latter tutored the witness.

In regard to the first ground, the petitioner has filed the copy of the evidence of Mr. Somappa, the Assistant Superintendent of Police in the case. Mr. Somappa has stated that prosecution witness No.2 is a steno-typist working in the office of the City Superintendent of Police, and his duty is to attend meetings, take down notes and send up typed reports, and that a copy of this report is sent to the Deputy Commissioner. The Government Advocate admitted this fact, and stated that these reports are merely passed on by the Deputy Commissioner to the Government for their information. The mere fact that the Magistrate came to know through a report that the petitioner uttered certain words at a public meeting does not

-3-

does not appear to me to be sufficient for holding that the petitioner will not receive a fair and impartial trial at his hands. No authority has been cited in support of this ground. If that were the law, then many of the cases could not be tried by any Magistrate in the State. That is not however the law. The petitioner urged more than once that he entertained the fear that he might not receive a fair and impartial trial in the court of the District Magistrate. This court must be satisfied that from the facts proved in the case the petitioner will not receive a fair and impartial trial in the court below: and the mere fact that the petitioner entertained an unreasonable belief that he will not have a fair trial is insufficient for ordering a transfer under Sec.526, Criminal Procedure Code. There is absolutely nothing in the Criminal Procedure Code for thus restricting the discretion of this Court by the opinion of the accused. I have thus no hesitation in stating that there is no substance in this ground.

The second ground was not referred to at all at the hearing and seems to me to be extremely frivolous and irrelevant. I may in this connection refer to the observations of Sir Cecil Henry Walsh A.C.J. in 99 Indian Cases 106, where also an exactly similar and scandalous affidavit was filed in support of an application for transfer. That learned Judge observed:-

*Persons who

-4-9

"persons who engage in what may be called political or social controversies, or controversial matters in the local - affairs of their own community, and what may be described generally as public affairs and who happen to be unable to do so without bringing themselves within, at any rate, an alleged breach of the criminal law, must take the local courts as they find them. There seems to be an impression abroad that you have only got to make yourself sufficiently objectionable to the local Magistrates, or the local authorities, so as to incur their displeasure, to render any judicial - officer in that particular district unfit to try your case. It is often put in argument, and I believe it is sometimes to be found in decided cases, that it is sufficient to found an application for transfer that the applicant is apprehensive that he will not get a fair trial. That is not the law. There is not the slightest justification for such a conclusion, & and there is ample authority throughout India establishing the contrary. There are instances of foolish orders. which can, no doubt, be found in the - reports in which some support seems to be lent to that idle proposition. No Court ought to interfere by an order for transfer unless

-5-

unless it is satisfied by clear and un-
~~impeach~~ impeachable evidence that the court, or
 individual, from whom it is proposed to
 transfer the case, has by some personal
conduct rendered himself unfit, or un-
likely to give the accused a fair trial.
 Subject to that salutary provision local
 people must take the local Courts as they
 find them. So far as the High Court is
 concerned it will not encourage the public
 belief that the Judicial and Magistrate
 Benches can be dragged into the arena of
 political and personal strife by means of
 applications, the foundation of which is
 a deliberate attempt to involve members
 of the local Bench who have a public duty
 to perform, in local and personal --
 controversy".

As regards the third ground there is -
 absolutely nothing in the evidence of Prosecution
 witness No.4 a copy of which is filed to indicate
 that the District Magistrate has committed himself
 in any way to any course of conduct which could
 be regarded as sufficient for a transfer. In fact
 no reference is made to any part taken by the -
 District Magistrate in the matter. The evidence
 also does not in the least support the extremely
 frivolous and scandalous allegation that the -
 Advocate for the complainant 'tutored' the --
 witness.

There is

37

There is thus no cause for any reasonable apprehension that the accused may not have a fair and impartial trial at the hands of the Magistrate. This is the second application for transfer presented by the accused. The first was rejected by this Court on 30th of June, and the present application was presented on 13-7-1931, and the first ground in the present application is virtually the same as the fourth ground in the -- previous application, which has already been dealt with in the previous order. The second ground was not pressed at the hearing; and the third has already been referred to. As pointed out in the previous order of this Court, the complaint was filed on the 30th of March 1931, and the accused appeared in court on the 21st April; and the reasons which led to the delay in the trial of the case are mentioned therein. Under Section 526 (8), Criminal Procedure Code, when the -- petitioner notifies his intention to apply for transfer, the case has to be adjourned. I have carefully examined the grounds alleged by the petitioner and they do not in the least suggest that he will not get a fair hearing. Repeated and vexatious transfer applications of the kind in question might enable an accused to stop a trial or enquiry altogether under Section 526 (8). It is unnecessary to state that under the new Criminal Procedure Code this Court has ample -- powers to award reasonable costs in favour of the persons opposing frivolous and vexatious -- applications

applications of the kind in question. In a proper case this court will certainly exercise the powers vested in this Court. In the recent Full Bench decision of the Bombay High Court (54 B. 553) Sir Amberson Marten Chief Justice observes:-

"We also cannot shut our eyes to the fact that repeated transfer applications of this kind might in certain events enable a complainant, or for a matter of that an accused, to stop a trial or enquiry altogether under Sec.526 (8), because as soon as one application for a transfer was rejected he could proceed forthwith to make another with only a possible liability for costs under Section 526(6A). But, fortunately, in our judgment, it is not open either to a complainant or to an accused to hinder the administration of justice in that way. We hold it to be clear that under Section 526-A. Criminal Procedure Code, we can, if necessary, exercise the inherent power of the High Court to prevent the abuse of the process to any Court; and in such a case as I have indicated we ought unhesitatingly to apply that power.

Section 561-A runs:-

"Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or affect the inherent power of the High Court to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any

-3-

to any order under this code, or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of Justice'.

To my mind it is clear that one of the ends of justice is to have a case properly heard and concluded within a reasonable time.

Accordingly, if frivolous and vexatious applications are resorted to as a means of preventing the ends of justice being attained, then I would hold that the court ought to exercise its above inherent power to prevent its process being thus abused.

So too in certain cases, speaking for myself, conduct of this sort might, I think, amount to contempt of Court which could be punished in various ways".

In my opinion there is absolutely no ground for transfer, and this present application is entirely a frivolous and vexatious one and is accordingly rejected.

Sd/- G. Sreenivasa Iyer,
J U D G E.

"C o p y"

M. S. Sreenivasa Iyer

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE.

Muz. 3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

ND 0562 GPR 0500 05 00

D. O. No. 17

9008440

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,
PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 18th August 1931.



Dear Sir,

I write to inform you that Criminal Case
No. 5 of 1931-32 on the file of the District Magis-
trate, Bangalore (Defamation case filed against Mr.
V. S. Sanjiva Rao) stands posted for hearing to the
1st September 1931.

19/8

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

H. V. Ramaswami, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
General Secretary to the Government
of H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips,
the notes must be copied or slips pasted on
this form.

Sub?

for perusal.

150
2/8

Sub file 3/9

none
2/8

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

In reply please refer to
No. 177

Tel. Address:—
"JURIST," Bangalore.

1229 41
P 830
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore 5th September 1931.
7/17

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore, BANGALORE.

GENERAL SECRETARY
TO
8 SEP 1931
No. 177

The Secretary to the Government
of H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, BANGALORE.

Sir,

Re: Defamation Case (filed against
Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva Rao) before the
District Magistrate, Bangalore.

8/9
I have the honor to state that as Mr. H.R.
Venkatasubba Rao could not attend the Court on the
1st instant the case was adjourned to the 19th Sept.
1931.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.
Government Advocate.

CSN.

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips
the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on
this form

Suit? for perusal

Suit 154 22.9

one
1-9

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

of 193

App. F. III—2]

Serial
No.

In reply please refer to
No. 218

Tel. Address:—
"JURIST," Bangalore

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore.... 21st September 1931.

GENERAL SECRETARY
22 SEP. 1931
No. 177
To

The Government Advocate
in Mysore, Bangalore.

The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

Re: Defamation Case (filed against Mr.
V. S. Sanjeeva Rao) before the -
District Magistrate, Bangalore.

In continuation of this office letter No.
177, dated the 7th September 1931, I have the honor
to state that the above case came on for hearing on
the 19th instant, and the Complainant (Mr. Venkata-
subba Rao) and another witness (Police Sergeant -
Krishnappa) for the prosecution were examined on -
that day. The case now stands adjourned to -
to-morrow,

In reply please refer to
No. 295

Tel. Address:—
"JURIST," Bangalore.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore 22nd September 1931.

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore, BANGALORE.

GENERAL SECRETARY.
22 SEP. 1931
No. 295

The Secretary to the Government
of H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, BANGALORE.

Sir,

Re: Criminal Case No. 5 of 1930-31 on the file
of the District Magistrate, Bangalore.
(Defamation Case filed against Mr. V.S.
Sanjeena Rao).

In continuation of my letter No. 218 dated the 21st
September 1931, I have the honor to state that the above case
came on for hearing this day and the evidence for the prose-
cution was closed. The accused has filed a statement and the
case stands adjourned to tomorrow for further proceedings.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

N. M. Aggarwal
Government Advocate.

Submitted for perusal

N.

First Member)

Second Member)

OFFICE OF THE
SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
23 SEP. 1931
No. 1052

me
23/9/31

me 23.9.31

me 23/9/31
me 23/9/31

me

[T

In reply please refer to,
No. 229/1

Tel. Address:—
"JURIST," Bangalore.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,


Bangalore 26th September 1931.

DEWAN'S
2337
1 - OCT 1931

28th

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore, BANGALORE.



GENERAL SECRETARY
28 SEP 1931
No. 101

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, BANGALORE.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 225 dated the
22nd September 1931, I have the honor to state that
Criminal Case No. 5 of 1930-31 on the file of the District
Magistrate, Bangalore, (Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva Rao - Accused)
came on for hearing on the 23rd instant and a charge was
framed against the accused under Sec. 500 I.P.C., The
case is now posted to the 1st proximo for the further
examination of witnesses for the prosecution.

Submitted for perusal,

2nd member

Dewan

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Government Advocate.

Sub to await further
report

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips,
the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on
this form.

45

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,

In reply please refer to

No. 2416

Tel. Address:—

"JURIST," Bangalore

Bangalore...6th...October...1931... 31

15/12/31
P

From,

The Government Advocate
in Mysore, BANGALORE.

GENERAL SECRETARY
7 OCT. 1931
No. 2416

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, BANGALORE.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No. 229,

mp
9.12.31
dated the 28th September 1931, I have the honor to state
that Criminal Case No.5/1930-31 on the file of the Dist.
Magistrate, Bangalore, (Mr. V.S.Sanjeeva Rao - Accused)
which was posted for hearing to the 2nd instant, stands
adjourned from that day to the 10th October 1931.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

W. S. Sanjeeva Rao

Government Advocate.

CSN.

D. O. No. 28

15/3-31
p 46

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,
PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 13th October 1931.

Dear Sir,

GENERAL SECRETARY
14 OCT. 1931
No. 145

In the matter of Criminal Case No. 5/30-31
on the file of the District Magistrate,
Bangalore, (Mr. H. R. Venkatasubba Rao
VERSUS Mr. V. S. Sanjeeva Rao).

The above case came on for hearing on Saturday the
10th instant. All the witnesses for the prosecution,
except Mr. H. V. Krishna Rao, Assistant Superintendent
of Police, were examined after charge on that day. Mr.
H. V. Krishna Rao could not be examined as he was not
present in court, and the case now stands adjourned to
the 28th instant.

Submitted for perusal

Yours sincerely,

Chief Secy)

mp
14/10

H. V. Ramaswami Esq.

Just Mems

Rg
15/10/31

ku 17/10/31 mp 19/10 Rg 22/10

H. V. Ramaswami, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
General Secretary to Government,
BANGALORE.

U 27/10/31

In reply please refer to
No. 311

Tel. Address:—
"JURIST," Bangalore.

1839/31
P. 831
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE, 4

Bangalore...3rd.....November.....1931.

GENERAL SECRETARY.
From 3 NOV. 1931
No. 1015

OFFICE OF THE
FIRST MEMBER COUNCIL
NOV 1931
No. 3466

The Government Advocate
in Mysore, BANGALORE.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, BANGALORE.

Sir,

I have the honor to state that Criminal Case
No. 5 of 1930-31 on the file of the District Magistrate,
Bangalore District, (Mr. V.S.Sanjeeva Rao - Accused)
came on for hearing on 28-10-31 and the cross examination
of the last witness for prosecution was closed on that
day. The case now stands adjourned to the 21st instant
for the examination of defence witnesses.

Submitted for perusal

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

First Member)

mp
3/4
18
5/4

M. S. Sanjeeva Rao

Government Advocate.

CSN.

2246
P83/48

In reply please refer to
No. 866

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore...24th November...19 31

Tel. Address :—
"JURIST," Bangalore

GENERAL SECRETARY
24 NOV. 1931
From No. 1025

(124)

The Government Advocate
in Mysore, BANGALORE.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department, BANGALORE.

one
25/11

Sir,

I have the honor to state that Criminal Case
No. 5 of 1930-31 on the file of the District Magistrate,
Bangalore, (Mr. V.S. Sanjeeva Rao - Accused) which was
posted for hearing to 21-11-1931 stands adjourned to
the 1st December 1931.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

sub^d for perusal.

15D
26/11

one
26/11

one
26/11

Government Advocate.
Shirur

CSN.

one
26/11

Routine Notes.

To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

D. O. No. 36

my
97

Law
9/1/32

2957 49
P.B. 31

GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,
PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 6th Jan. 1932

7/17

Dear Sir,

Re: Criminal Case No. 5 of 1930-31
on the file of the District -
Magistrate, Bangalore Dist.
(V. S. Sanjeeva Rao - accused).

I write to inform you that the above case which was posted for arguments to the 2nd instant, was not taken up that day, as the accused did not attend the Court. The case, therefore stands adjourned to the 9th instant, for the same purpose (viz., arguments).

Yours sincerely,

N. Madhava Rao

N. Madhava Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government.

Subd. for perusal.

TSD
8/1

my
8/1

Sub B

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

()
the 193 .

Date of issue 19/2/32

Signed by M. N. N.

List of enclosures

Copied by 18/2

Examined by

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No

To

The Govt. Advocate

Sir

With reference to

Your D.O. dated 12th Feb 1932the result of the
~~intimating~~ ~~not~~ ~~judgment~~ ~~was~~
defamation case filed
pronounced Carving and
against
Sentence the accused V.S.Sanyo Rao in C. Case no. 5 of 30-31
on the file of the Dist. Magistrate Blue
to 3 months S.D. and to pay a
fine of Rs. 500 and in default
of payment of fine to undergo
Simple Imprisonment for 6 months
months. I am directed torequest that a copy of the
judgment may kindly be obtained
and sent for information of Govt.
dardM. N. N. I have en
17/2 for Ch. Secy

Confidential.

51

18-2-1932.

The

The Government Advocate,
Bangalore.

With reference to your D.O. dated 12th February 1932 intimating the result of the defamation case filed against V.S. Sanjiva Rao in Cr. Case No. 5/30-31 on the file of the District Magistrate, Bangalore, I am to request that a copy of the judgment may kindly be obtained and sent for information of Government early.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Chief Secretary to Government.

NSG.2.

D. C

4103 231
No-30-6P 52
GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE'S CHAMBERS,

S PUBLIC OFFICES,

Bangalore, 7th March 1932.



As desired in your letter No. P.
5281/Law dated the 7th instant, I am forwarding herewith, for your information, a copy of the Judgment passed by the District Magistrate, Bangalore District, in Criminal Case No. 5 of 1930-31 (H. R. Venkatasubba Rao vs. V. S. Sanjeeva Rao).

2. I learn that the accused has filed an appeal to the Sessions Court against his conviction, and that the same was posted for hearing to this day. But it seems to have been adjourned to some day next week as the appellant's counsel found it inconvenient to argue the case to-day.

3. The copy of the Judgment sent herewith

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

()
the 193 .

Date of issue 14/3/32

Signed by Mr. Ray

List of enclosures

Copied by Mr. [Signature]

Examined by

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No

To

The Government Advocate.

Sir, Criminal case no. 5 of 1930-31,
(Mr. H. R. Venkatasubba Rao vs
V. S. Sanjiv Rao) on the file of the
District Magistrate, Bangalore

It is learnt that in the above
case the accused Sanjiv Rao
has filed an appeal against his
conviction by the District Magistrate,
Bangalore. It is necessary that
the conviction should be supported
and now that Mr. Venkatasubba
Rao is dead, I am directed to request
you to represent the Government
in the appeal and support the
conviction. The result of the case

67

may kindly be reported
in due course.

Shanook

mp
12/3

For chief Secy

bn

5498

Copy to Dr. Singh, Bangalore
for information

SUBJECT

.....

.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to

No

5740 (1)

To

The D. of Police.

General and Revenue Secretariat

Sir,

()

the

193

I am directed to

Date of issue

30/3/32

enclose herewith a copy of your

letter no. C.C. 29/10/31 dated 24th Nov '31

~~addressed to the Chief Secretary~~

as desired requested in your letter no

Signed by

M. S. S.

~~C.C. 29/10/31~~ dated 20. 3. 32.

I have seen

TSB
29/3

OMP
29.3 for Genl Secy

List of enclosures

Copied by

TSB
29/3

Examined by